

KEEPING RECORDS ON CRIMINALS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am interested in the discussion that the Senator from California just had on the subject of crime. It reminds me again of the urge to ask all Members of the Senate to consider cosponsoring a piece of legislation I introduced last week on this issue. The issue of crime is one that concerns every American, and I introduced some legislation dealing with the issue of trying to establish a computer record of all people in this country who commit felonies.

It is incredible that we have a circumstance in our country where we keep track of a couple hundred million credit cards, and if you take one of those credit cards and go to a department store and try to buy a shirt, they will run it through a magnetic imager, and in 20 seconds they discover whether the card is good or whether it has reached its limit. If they are able to do that in the private sector on credit with a couple hundred million credit cards, we ought to be able to, for a whole series of reasons, keep an updated, accurate computer list of everybody who has committed felonies in this country. That way, when judges sentence somebody, they know who they are sentencing. Did this person commit a crime in Idaho 5 years ago, Montana 2 years ago, North Dakota last year, and Kansas this year? That is the kind of criminal record history we ought to have in this country. Regrettably, we do not. We have the NCIC and the III, but 80 percent of the records needed to be in up-to-date criminal records files of everybody who committed felonies are not there. It does not take Dick Tracy to figure out who is going to commit the next violent crime in our country. In almost every instance, it will be somebody who has previously committed crimes, somebody who has been in the system, and somebody who has been in prison—maybe not to prison, but maybe in prison and is now out of prison and back on the streets.

That is why we need, it seems to me, for law enforcement purposes, for judges, for a whole series of reasons, an updated computer listing of everybody in this country who has committed felonies. That ought to be updated every day across the country in order that we might effectively combat crime in America.

THE BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I came to the floor today to talk just for a moment about the budget negotiations, not so much to talk about what might or might not happen in the negotiations, but to suggest that this is going to be a very important week with respect to the question of whether we are able to make progress in trying to reach two goals—first, balancing the Federal budget. That is an important goal and it is one we ought to reach in

the interest of our country. Second, balancing the Federal budget while we meet some of the priorities in doing so. Balancing the Federal budget without injuring the Medicaid or Medicare Program, so that someone who is elderly in this country and who is sick will not understand that they have to pay more for Medicare and get less as a result of our balancing the budget. We can balance the budget and do it the right way, retaining the priorities in Medicare and Medicaid and education and agriculture and the environment. It does not mean you cannot cut spending in all of those areas. It just means you cannot cut spending sufficiently so that you injure these programs at the same time that you have decided in the budget bill to provide a very significant tax cut. That represents the question of priorities.

I want to back up just for a moment and refer to something I read yesterday in a newspaper that I thought was an interesting piece. It was written by Jim Hoagland in the Washington Post. I commend Members of the Senate to read it; it is called "Surrender to the Money Men."

He starts out discussing something I have discussed previously on the floor of the Senate—that the stock market in America is at a record high, corporate profits are at near records in this country, productivity of the American work force is up. We are told the American economy is the most competitive in the world, but while all of these things are happening, wages in America continue to go down, and job security in our country continues to be diminished.

We hear about downsizing and layoffs, surplus workers, being more competitive; we hear about all of those things and then understand that it causes an enormous amount of anxiety among American workers because they feel somehow they are now surplus and they are the lost part of this economic equation called "globalization" in which in our economic enterprises' interest in being more competitive, they decide to produce elsewhere and ship back here. A corporation, international corporation, can become more competitive, they think, by deciding to produce shoes and shirts and belts, or trousers and cars and television sets, in foreign countries where labor is very inexpensive and then ship those back to our country for sale.

I understand why big corporations think it is in their interest to do so. It is something called profits. If you can get someone to work for 50 cents an hour and not be bothered by the issue of polluting water and polluting air and by the difficulties of the prohibition against hiring child labor, if you can get rid of those kinds of meddlesome difficulties by moving and producing offshore, you can make more profits if you can produce offshore and sell here.

Well, the result of that kind of strategy has created another kind of deficit

in this country that no one is talking about. We are talking about the budget deficit every single day. Already today, I have been to two meetings dealing with the budget deficit. I will spend much of this week, I assume, in negotiating sessions with other negotiators talking about the budget deficit.

There is not even a whisper in this Chamber or in this Congress about the other deficit, the trade deficit. We will, this year, have a merchandise trade deficit that is larger than our budget deficit. What does the merchandise trade deficit mean? It means that jobs have left our country. It means that our country has an economy that has weakened because we measure economic progress in this country by what we consume rather than what we produce.

It seems to me that we ought to start worrying about the twin deficits in our country—the budget deficit and the trade deficit. The budget deficit, one can make the economic argument, is the deficit we owe to ourselves but for the fact that it is unequally distributed; it causes problems in that regard. One can make the argument that it does not require a reduced standard of living to pay the budget deficit in this country. You cannot make the similar argument about the trade deficit. Inevitably, repaying the trade deficit will mean a lower standard of living in our country, and that is why this year, we will have the largest merchandise trade deficit in our history, and it is a very serious problem for our country.

I hope that at some point soon we start talking here in the Senate about the twin deficits, the budget deficit and the trade deficit. The trade deficit, as I indicated, relates to the budget deficit because there are things in the reconciliation bill here in the Congress that would make it even easier for those who want to move jobs offshore and to produce elsewhere and, therefore, it meets our trade deficit or makes it easier to do so.

I have shared with my colleagues on another occasion a provision in the so-called Balanced Budget Act in the reconciliation bill. I want to do that again today. It is a small provision that deals with tax law and the product called "deferral," deferring income tax obligations on foreign subsidiaries owned by domestic corporations that earn money overseas in their foreign subsidiary and do not have to pay taxes on it until it is repatriated to our country. Well, in 1993, we passed a law that tightened up on that and said that does not make sense. This is an incentive that says let us move the factories overseas and take American jobs and move them abroad.

What we have now is a provision by the majority party that says, "By the way, we will take this little provision that is an insidious incentive to move jobs overseas by multinational corporations and tell the multinational corporations we like this tax incentive so much, we want to increase it for

you. We want to boost this tax incentive. We want to make it more generous if you will take your jobs and move them overseas."

I am thinking I ought to have a scavenger hunt to find out who in the U.S. Senate decided it was a good idea to propose that multinational corporations ought to have more of a tax incentive for moving their jobs overseas.

I ask any of my colleagues in the next couple of days, as we are working through this reconciliation bill, who authored this? Who thought it was a good idea? Who believes we ought to change our Tax Code to make it more attractive to move American jobs overseas? Who thinks we ought to increase the tax incentive to shut down the American plant, move it offshore?

It makes no sense to me. This will increase our trade deficit. This will not solve our fiscal policy deficit. This will weaken our country.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I wonder if my friend from North Dakota would yield for a question?

Mr. DORGAN. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I was moved by the reference to the increase in trade deficit, and I ask my colleague if he would not agree that nearly half of that trade deficit is the cost of imported oil?

Obviously, as a Senator from the State producing the most oil from the standpoint of domestic production, would it not be in our national energy security interest to try to relieve our dependence on imported oil, hence reduce the deficit balance of payment by developing some of our resources, if we can do it in a way that is compatible with the environment and ecology?

I am particularly speaking of potential relief that we might find if, indeed, there are substantial reserves of oil in the Arctic oil reserve as part of ANWR.

It would seem to me this would alleviate a concern both the Senator from North Dakota and I have inasmuch as oil does make up just about half of our trade deficit.

Mr. DORGAN. My own view about our oil import situation is that we ought to have an oil import fee. I have always felt that. I think an oil import fee solves a series of problems for us. It would stimulate more domestic production, first; reduce the trade deficit, second; and provide revenue by which you eliminate or reduce the fiscal policy deficit as well.

The Senator from Alaska has been an articulate and forceful supporter of opening ANWR. He and I share one goal, and that is I think we ought to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. I would like to start with a first step of an oil import fee which I have advocated for some long while. I have authored them, and I have offered them in the House Ways and Means committee when I served there. I think that would be a productive first step.

In any event, we must, it seems to me, begin addressing this trade deficit. The failure to do so—even if we solve

the budget deficit problem—the failure to address the trade deficit problem is going to be a crippling problem for this country.

The point I made with this tax provision is—and I am thinking of suggesting we have a rule in the Senate similar to the one they have in the House—that if you propose a provision like this in the budget system, you have to disclose who it is that is offering this, who thinks it makes sense to provide a more generous circumstance in our Tax Code to say to somebody, "Move your jobs overseas. Move your plant out of here. Hire your workers in a foreign country." Who thinks that make sense, to increase a tax subsidy to do that?

There ought to be, first of all, no subsidy. We ought to completely eliminate the insidious tax incentive that exists now to say, "By the way, you have a factory. Close it here. Move the jobs overseas to a tax haven and make the same product. Ship it back here and we will give you a tax break."

It ought to be completely eliminated. This provision, stuck in the reconciliation bill, opens it wider and says, "By the way, this is a good idea, we should do more of it."

This week, if I can find the Member of the Senate who thinks this is a good idea, I would like that person to identify himself or herself, and I would like to spend a while on the floor debating that. So I invite whoever it is, give me a call, come to the floor and talk about this kind of tax policy and whether it makes sense for our country.

BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. DORGAN. Let me, in the final minute, say a word about the budget negotiations. It is my fervent hope by the end of this week we will have reached a budget agreement. That makes sense for this country. It makes sense for both political parties. It makes sense for the President. It just is the right thing to do.

It ought to be an agreement that balances the budget and does it the right way. There are certain priorities that make sense. It seems to me we ought to negotiate between now and the end of this week to reach an agreement that balances this budget and does it the right way.

I know time is short and we face kind of an urgent situation with the December 15 continuing resolution, but there is not any reason, with good will on both sides to balance this budget, there is not any reason at all that we cannot find common ground.

We have not survived 200 years in a representative democracy without understanding the need to compromise. Compromise in a democratic system like ours is the essence of getting things done.

I hope by the end of this week we will be able to stand on the floor of the Senate and say we reached an agreement and we reached an agreement to balance the budget that is good for this country.

RICHARD C. HALVERSON

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, one of the first people I met when I came to the Senate, and one on whose kind interest I came to rely, was Richard Halverson, the man who served as Chaplain of the Senate from 1981 until early this year.

Many of my colleagues have commented on his service to the Senate, and to all of us who work here. He considered what he called the Senate family—from the most senior cook to the least junior Senator—his flock. His approachable manner and generous ways endeared him to us all. "I try never to be in a hurry," he said in an interview with the Hill last year. Everyone responded to this gentle, important courtesy in a place where schedules are demanding and often implacable.

Kipling wrote of those who "can talk with kings and keep the common touch." Dr. Halverson, in the course of his ministry here, demonstrated that he was capable of this skill, and each of us appreciated that when he talked with us, as well as with kings, we were elevated by his special attention.

He will be in our thoughts and prayers for years to come.

RETIREMENT OF GEN. ROBERT L. DEZARN

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, when you've been in public life as long as I have, you see a lot of hard working, dedicated people in public service. But, every once in a while you come into contact with someone whose leadership qualities make them stand out from the rest. The head of Kentucky's National Guard, Adj. Gen. Robert L. DeZarn is that kind of leader. Over the years, he's been able to instill a sense of common purpose, and in doing so, bring out the best possible performance in everyone around him. And while we know that he will continue to contribute his talents in other ways, General DeZarn's retirement today will be a tremendous loss to those under his command and to the State as a whole.

It's been said that "a general is as good or as bad as the troops under his command make him." There is no doubt that Kentucky's National Guard will continue to make Kentucky and the Nation proud long after General DeZarn steps down. But, anyone who knows the Adjutant General also knows that he brought to his command an uncommon blend of courage, intelligence and compassion that will be sorely missed.

Over the past 4 years, as the Kentucky Guard was called upon to respond to natural disasters or as our Nation sought them out to help ease discord around the world, I always knew that General DeZarn was working behind the scenes to assure order, to assure total commitment, and in the end, to assure victory over adversity.